UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,550	11/13/2003	Binh T. Nguyen	IGT1P545/P000758-001	9163
	7590 02/19/201 Villeneuve & Sampson	EXAMINER		
Attn: IGT P.O. Box 70250	•	LEIVA, FRANK M		
Oakland, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3714		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/712,550	NGUYEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	FRANK M. LEIVA	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).  On which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1:	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriat	n. LED WITHIN TWO e extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	hortened statutory period for reply origin	nally set in the final Offic	e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed amendment of the proposed amendment of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, between the proposed amendment(s) filed after a filed amendment filed after a filed amendment filed after a filed amendment filed amendment filed amendment filed after a filed amendment filed	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); eer form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.1 <sup>o</sup> 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all-	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor		,
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 23-28, 42, 44, 48.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	will not be entered, or b)      will will     wi	-	-
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ul>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	P10/56/08) Paper No(s)		
/Peter D. Vo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new limitation contains the feature of "a second data storage device", that was not previously mentioned. Not being new matter it still changes the scope of the claims where a new issues for revision will be required. The amended claims do not place the application in better form for appeal, and will not be entered. These newly added limitations have not been previously considered. The examiner will need to conduct new search before the examiner is able to determine the patentability of the claimed invention.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are directed toward the newly added limitations of the independent claims, and are deemed moot. Since the scope of the claims have has been changed, the application will require further search to determined patentability. Since the arguments have not overcome the rejections the examiner deems the rejections proper and the request does not place the application in condition of allowance.